

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the examiner for performing a thorough search. By this amendment, Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 12-13, 15-16, and 25-30 are amended. Claims 14 and 25 are cancelled, and no claims are added. Hence, Claims 1-13, 15-24, and 25-30 are pending.

The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, amendments made to the claims as indicated herein have been made to exclusively improve readability and clarity of the claims and not for the purpose of overcoming alleged prior art.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed December 6, 2004 is addressed hereinafter.

I. DRAWINGS

The Office Action does not accept or object to the drawings using one of the check boxes on the Office Action Summary sheet. Applicants respectfully request review of the drawings and an indication of acceptance or objection in the next communication.

II. ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

A. CLAIMS 1-11 AND 14-30

Claims 1-11 and 14-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by Reisman, U.S. Pat. No. 6,557,054. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

A claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegal Bros. Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. Den* 484 U.S. 827 (1987). Anticipation also “requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure of all elements of a claimed invention arranged as in the claim.” *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 USPQ 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Because Reisman fails to provide particular features recited in the claims, Reisman does not anticipate the claims.

Claim 1, for example, distinguishes over Reisman in three ways:

1. Claim 1 recites a method whose steps are carried out by a personal server that executes at the client. In contrast, Reisman does not show a server that executes at the client. Reisman figure 12 shows all servers (136, 132) separated from the client (local station 122) by the telephone network, ISP, and Internet.

2. Claim 1 recites a method that retrieves updated channel content without communicating the channel selection information across the network. Reisman, however, communicates all selection information across the network (col.15 line 22).

3. Claim 1 recites a method that synthesizes original, personalized electronic documents from updated channel content from various sources. But Reisman, at col. 17 line 59 to col. 18 line 46 as referenced in the Office Action, only shows updates of a single "news magazine" product from a single source with discrete new "issues". Reisman does not show the combination and synthesis of updated channel content from different sources into an entirely original, personalized electronic document. Reisman's other examples likewise show only updates of a single item from its own original source rather than the synthesis of updates from different sources into a new document.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 recites subject matter not anticipated by Reisman. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Each of Claims 2-11 and 15-24 depends, directly or indirectly, on Claim 1, and therefore includes each and every feature identified above for Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2-11 and 15-24 are allowable over Reisman for the same reasons set forth above for Claim 1. Claim 14 and Claim 25 are canceled, and therefore the rejection is moot with respect to Claim 14 and Claim 25.

Moreover, each of Claims 2-11 and 15-24 contains at least one feature that independently renders it patentable over Reisman. For example, Claim 2 recites a method allowing the user to create and store at the client, custom, personalized virtual space organization information. Reisman (col.18 line 52 to col.19 line 58) describes two examples, a news magazine and a retail catalog, that are updated via the transporter component. In both examples, the layout and space organization information associated with the news magazine and retail catalog are defined and created by the magazine and catalog publishers at the server. Reisman does not show a method where a user can create and store a custom, personalized virtual space organization. Reisman (col.21 lines 4-47) describes two more examples of computer software updates, and packaging of the transporter with UI/DB software. As with the previous examples, the updates described by Reisman, such as new tax forms from the government, are pre-defined at the server and there is no method for the user to create and store custom, personalized virtual space organization information at the client.

Furthermore, Claim 2 recites a method comprising the step of synthesizing one or more electronic documents that contain the updated channel content from various sources. In Reisman's magazine, catalog, software update, and packaging examples, each document is generated using updates from its own source only (for the magazine, updated magazine content from the magazine source, for the catalog, updated catalog content from the catalog source, and for software updates and packaging, updated software content from the software source). Reisman does not show a method where content from various sources are combined and synthesized into an entirely new, personalized document at the client.

Claim 3 recites a method for receiving an update specification, identifying an update method and a time value, and issuing a request in accordance with those specifications. Reisman (col.21 line 4 to col.22 line 53) describes examples of computer software updates and packaging

the transporter to allow software publishers to incorporate the transporter's capabilities. Reisman does not describe a method for receiving an update specification that identifies an update method to be used for the content update, nor does Reisman describe the use of a time value as part of the update specification. Reisman (col.24 lines 14-63) further elaborates on the utility of packaging the transporter into other software products, but still does not discuss the use of an update specification containing an update method identification or a time value.

Claim 5 recites a method wherein each rendering context comprises a style sheet, template, script, helper reference, or applet. Reisman (col. 21 line 4 to col.22 line 53 and col.23 lines 7-64) do not discuss style sheets, templates, scripts, helper references, or applets.

Claim 6 recites that the synthesizing step comprises combining the rendering context with the updated channel content to result in creating and storing an HTML page. Reisman (col.34 line 32 to col.35 line 56) describes the use of the transporter to transmit completed HTML pages that were defined and synthesized at the source server and not at the client. Reisman does not describe a method where updated channel content from various sources is synthesized together into a new HTML page at the client.

Claim 7 is patentable over Reisman for the same reasons as Claim 6. Furthermore, Reisman (col.40 lines 1-53) describes a "web package server" (136 fig.12) that is located across the public telephone network, and does not reside at the client.

Claims 26-28 are independent claims having the same features as Claim 1, but expressed in different formats. Claims 26-28 distinguish over Reisman in the same ways set forth above for Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 26-28 are allowable over Reisman for the same reasons given above.

Independent Claim 29 distinguishes over Reisman in three ways:

1. Claim 29 recites a personal server that executes at the client. Reisman does not show a server that executes at the client. Reisman figure 12 shows all servers (136, 132) separated from the client (local station 122) by the telephone network, ISP, and Internet.

2. Claim 29 recites a personal server that retrieves updated channel content without communicating the channel selection information across a network. Reisman, col.15 line 22, communicates all selection information across the network.

3. Claim 29 recites a personal server that synthesizes original, personalized electronic documents from updated channel content from various sources. This language distinguishes over Reisman (col. 17 line 59 to col. 18 line 46, as referenced in the Office Action) because Reisman only shows updates of a single "news magazine" product from a single source with discrete new "issues". Reisman does not show the combination and synthesis of updated channel content from different sources into an entirely new and unique electronic document. Reisman's other examples likewise show only updates of a single item from its own original source, rather than the synthesis of updates from different sources into a new document.

Regarding the "added limitations" in Claim 29, referred to in the Office Action, Reisman fails to provide the same structure. Reisman (at col. 43 and col. 49) shows methods for managing, relocating, coding, and rewriting links embedded in web content, but does not show a page synthesizer that synthesizes one or more original, personalized electronic documents that contain updated channel content from various sources. Reisman col. 55 shows a method for retrieving updated music information, but does not show a page synthesizer that synthesizes one or more original, personalized electronic documents that contain updated channel content from various sources.

Claim 30 depends on Claim 29, and therefore includes each and every feature identified above for Claim 29. Therefore, Claim 30 is allowable over Reisman for the same reasons set forth above for Claim 29.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

B. CLAIMS 12 AND 13

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Reisman in view of Linden, U.S. Pat. No. 6,360,254. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, the Office Action does not properly characterize the teachings of Linden and Reisman, separately or in combination. Linden shows a system where URL links are encoded with an authentication token at a remote server, and are then sent to users via e-mail. When users activate those URL links, they are returned to the remote server where the encoded authentication token in the URL is validated to allow access to a private resource.

In contrast, Claim 12 recites a method where a content server embeds multiple content tokens (not authentication tokens) into channel content (not URL links). This channel content is received by the client (not via e-mail), and the tokens are replaced by other channel content or personal content at the client. The client does not use these tokens to return to the remote server as in Linden.

Neither Linden nor Reisman show a personal server executing at the client. Neither Linden nor Reisman show an iteration of a replacement step over channel content by a personal server executing at the client.

Further, Linden and Reisman do not contain any suggestion, express or implied, that they be combined, or combined in the manner suggested. In fact, Reisman teaches away from a combination with Linden. Reisman describes a "transporter [which] automatically effects communication sessions" (Abstract) whereas in Linden, the user must manually access and

activate private URLs sent through e-mail. Linden's manual user interaction is precisely what Reisman's invention intends to reduce or eliminate.

Moreover, Reisman describes a transporter that installs resources to the user station for local access (abstract, fig.6, fig.12), whereas in Linden, the "private data records" are stored on the remote server, not on the user station, and require remote access, not local access (abstract, and 42, 46 in fig. 1). In other words, the user access validation that Linden provides, based on tokens, is not necessary in Reisman since resources are installed locally. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the present application was filed, would have no reason to combine Reisman and Linden. A skilled artisan would have no reason to consider using token-based user access validation for access to local resources.

The specific passages cited in the Office Action do not show the features of the claims identified above. For example, the Office Action relies on Reisman col. 21, lines 4-47. However, this passage discusses updates to software products, such as updated tax forms for tax software, and discusses packaging Reisman's transporter component together with UI/DB authoring tools so that products created using the authoring tools will automatically include the functionality of the transporter. Reisman makes no reference to a virtual space specification, or to a page organization specification, nor does Reisman describe or refer to the replacement of any type of tokens in the updated channel content with either other channel content, or personal content information located at the client.

The Office Action further relies on Reisman col. 29, lines 8-61, which elaborate on the packaging of Reisman's transporter component together with UI/DB authoring tools. Here, Reisman provides further details on the various levels of transporter functionality that may be offered to software product authors who are building UI/DB products that incorporate the transporter. However, Reisman does not describe or refer to the replacement of any type of

tokens in the updated channel content with either other channel content, or personal content information located at the client.

The Office Action also relies on Linden FIG. 1, and col. 3, line 31 to col. 4, line 56. While Linden uses the term "token", Linden's tokens are distinct in form, function, and purpose from the tokens referred to in Claim 12. First, in Linden, tokens are generated at the server, sent to users via e-mail, and then returned to the server again via a URL. In contrast, in Claim 12, the tokens are embedded in updated channel content, which are retrieved by the user, and are never returned to the server.

Second, in Linden, the user does not replace the token. In fact, for Linden's scheme to work, the token must not be replaced, otherwise the validation step will fail. In Claim 12, the tokens embedded in the updated channel content are replaced at the user station with other updated channel content or personal content information located at the client.

Third, in Linden, the token acts a unique identifier. In Claim 12, the token is not unique, but rather is a placeholder which will be replaced by updated channel content or personal content information located at the client. As such, a token may be embedded multiple times in the updated channel content, and therefore the tokens are not necessarily unique, as they must be in Linden.

Fourth, in Linden, the token is associated with a user record stored in a database on the server. In Claim 12, the tokens are not associated with any information stored on the server. To the contrary, the tokens in Claim 12 are associated with and refer to updated channel content or personal content information located at the client.

Claim 13 has the same features as Claim 12, with additional features. Because Claim 13 has the same features as Claim 12, Claim 13 is allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 12.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSIONS & MISCELLANEOUS

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time for one (1) month, and otherwise to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. A law firm check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Christopher J. Palermo
Reg. No. 42,056

Dated: April 5, 2005

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 x202
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076